



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/712,832

11/12/2003

Timothy Addington

43314/267419

9522

826

7590

07/20/2009

ALSTON & BIRD LLP

BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA

101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000

CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000

EXAMINER

SCHNURR, JOHN R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2421

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/20/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/712,832	Applicant(s) ADDINGTON ET AL.	
	Examiner JOHN SCHNURR	Art Unit 2421	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 May 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 and 44-130 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-39, 54-106, 117-120 and 125-130 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 40-42, 44-53, 107-116 and 121-124 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 05/08/2009 has been entered.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 40-42, 44-53, 107-116 and 121-124 are pending and have been examined.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 40-42, 44-53, 107-116 and 121-124 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Although a new grounds of rejection has been used to meet the claim limitations, reference Borelli (US 2006/0020525) is still used to meet several claim limitations.

In response to applicant's argument that Borelli does not disclose selecting a service provider using the host type as a basis, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Borelli teaches scanning the host to determine host type information, [0038]. This information is then used to determine if the host type is compatible with a service provider, [0040]. Therefore, the service provider is selected based on the host type information, i.e. if the host type information is not compatible with the service provider then the service provider is not selected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 53 recites the limitation "the third provisioning message" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims **40, 44, 45, 48-51, 53 and 114-116** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Donlan et al. (US 2004/0088737)**, herein Donlan, in view of **Borelli et al. (US 2006/0020525)**, herein Borelli.

Consider **claim 40**, Donlan clearly teaches a system for provisioning a service comprising:

an enhanced services system (ESS) receiving a provisioning message **(Fig. 1: ITV Provisioning Manager 104 receives provisioning data indicating a customer has paid an overdue bill, [0046] and [0064].)**, said ESS using a host identifier **(ITV client device unit address, [0046])** to ascertain a host file associated with a host type, said host type determined in part by said host identifier, the host file used to identify a host protocol file used for generating a message for provisioning a host identified by said host identifier. **(Fig. 3: Data storage 228 provides all customer account and service profiles required for service activation, [0041]. An update STB response message 508 is derived from the processing of the update STB request, [0065]-[0066].)**

However, Donlan does not explicitly teach an Internet Service Provisioning Gateway (ISPG) operatively connected to a communications network, capable of

Art Unit: 2421

hosting a web site accessed by a user at a computer connected to the communications network wherein the ISPG is configured to provide cable service options to the computer and receiving a first provisioning message comprising service related input data entered by the user comprising a user identifier and a host identifier, the ISPG capable of generating a second provisioning message including the service related input data, a the user identifier, and the host identifier.

In an analogous art, Borelli, which discloses a system for service provisioning, clearly teaches an Internet Service Provisioning Gateway (ISPG) operatively connected to a communications network, **(Fig. 2 ISP website 20)** capable of hosting a web site accessed by a user at a computer connected to the communications network wherein the ISPG is configured to provide cable service options to the computer **(The website displays the available service options, [0048].)** and receiving a first provisioning message comprising service related input data entered by the user comprising a user identifier, the ISPG capable of generating a second provisioning message including the service related input data and the user identifier; **(The customer selects the desired services and provides contact information, [0052], and client information, [0038], this information is then forwarded to provisioning manager 48, Fig. 11 [0064].)**

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Donlan by replacing the customer service representative with a website, as taught by Borelli, for the benefit of reducing the cost of the provisioning system.

Consider **claim 44**, Donlan clearly teaches the host file contains a configuration message associated with the host type **(device type 334, [0043])**, the configuration message further associated with a service identified by the service related input data **(service type 358, [0043])**.

Consider **claim 45**, Donlan clearly teaches the ESS is capable of generating a legacy based command to a cable headend. **([0046])**

Consider **claim 48**, Borelli clearly teaches the ISPG is operatively connected to a location serviceability database. **(Fig. 2: Database 28 stores information indicating locations that may be serviced, [0041].)**

Consider **claim 49**, Borelli clearly teaches the location serviceability database receives location data associated with the user and selects at least one cable system provider based on the location data. **(The database receives customer location data and selects services available to the customer, [0041] and [0048].)**

Art Unit: 2421

Consider **claim 50**, Borelli clearly teaches the ISPG is capable of selecting one of a plurality of ESSs operatively connected to the ISPG, the selection determined in part on data received from the computer. **(Based on the services selected by the customer the provisioning message is transmitted to the selected providers, [0067] Borelli.)**

Consider **claim 51**, Donlan clearly teaches a system for provisioning a service in a cable system comprising: a serviceability database receiving a provisioning message containing an indication of a user's host type. **(ITV client device unit address, [0046])**

However, Donlan does not explicitly teach:

an Internet Service Provisioning Gateway (ISPG) operatively connected to the Internet, capable of hosting a web site, the web site configured to receive service related input data from a user at a computer connected to the Internet and provide cable service options to be displayed on the computer, the ISPG configured to receive from the computer both said service related input data and cable subscriber location data wherein said service related input data comprises an indication of the user's host type, the ISPG configured to generate a first provisioning message having a first format including the cable subscriber location data and said indication of the user's host type; and

a serviceability database operatively connected to the ISPG to receive the first provisioning message, the serviceability database containing a plurality of cable service provider location data and a plurality of cable service provider identifiers wherein each cable service provider identifier is further associated with at least one host type identifier, the serviceability database capable of receiving the cable subscriber location data and selecting a cable service provider identifier compatible with said subscriber location data and said indication of the user's host type, the serviceability database further capable of generating a second provisioning message including service related input data and at least one associated host type identifier.

In an analogous art, Borelli, which discloses a system for service provisioning, clearly teaches:

an Interact Service Provisioning Gateway (ISPG) operatively connected to the Internet, capable of hosting a web site, **(Fig. 2 ISP website 20)** the web site configured to receive service related input data from a user as a computer connected to the Internet and provide cable service options to be displayed on the computer, **(The website displays the available**

Art Unit: 2421

service options, [0048].) wherein said service related input data comprises an indication of the user's host type **([0038] and [0040])**, the ISPG configured to receive from the computer both said service related input data and cable subscriber location data, the ISPG configured to generate a first provisioning message having a first format including the cable subscriber location data; **(The database 28 receives customer location data and selects services available to the customer, [0041] and [0048].)**

a serviceability database operatively connected to the ISPG to receive the first provisioning message, the serviceability database containing a plurality of cable service provider location data **(Fig. 2: Database 28 stores information indicating locations that maybe serviced, [0041].)** and a plurality of cable service provider identifiers wherein each cable service provider identifier is further associated with at least one host type **([0038] and [0040])**, the serviceability database capable of receiving the cable subscriber location data and selecting a cable service provider identifier compatible with said subscriber location data and said indication of the user's host type, the serviceability database further capable of generating a second provisioning message including service related input data. **(The database receives customer location data and host type and selects services available to the customer, [0041] and [0048].)**

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Donlan by replacing the customer service representative with a website, as taught by Borelli, for the benefit of reducing the cost of the provisioning system.

Consider **claim 53**, Borelli combined with Tamura, as in claim 50, clearly teaches the ESS is further configured to authenticate the third provisioning message received from the ISPG prior to generating the configuration message. **([0061] Borelli)**

Consider **claim 114**, see claim 40.

Consider **claim 115**, Donlan clearly teaches the one provisioning message is received at an enhanced service system ("ESS") associated with the service provider. **([0046] and [0064].)**

Consider **claim 116**, Donlan clearly teaches the one provisioning message is received at a billing system associated with the service provider. **(Components 104-166 includes billing system 114, [0046].)**

Art Unit: 2421

7. Claims **52, 107-109, 111, 112 and 121-124** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Donlan et al. (US 2004/0088737)** in view of **Borelli et al. (US 2006/0020525)** further in view of **McKeown et al. (US 2004/0261116)**, herein McKeown, in view of **Makofka et al. (US 2002/0112175)**, herein Makofka.

Consider **claim 52**, Donlan combined with Borelli, as in claim 51, clearly teaches a web site provisioning system communicating with an enhanced services system.

However, Donlan combined with Borelli does not explicitly teach sending the host-specific configuration message to a host associated with the cable subscriber.

In an analogous art, McKeown, which discloses a system for service provisioning, clearly teaches sending the host-specific configuration message to a host associated with the cable subscriber. **(Paragraph 0077 describes a provisioning sequence used to allow "end-to-end" provisioning of a user device. Paragraph 0084 describes determining parameters automatically by querying the user device itself. Paragraph 0142 discusses remotely reconfiguring the user access device to modify a characteristic of the service delivered. And finally, Paragraph 0154 discusses dynamically assigning addresses to end user devices. The examiner notes that Paragraphs 0274-0283 describe the dynamic assignment of IP addresses provisioned to end user devices through the well-known DHCP protocol. Therefore, McKeown teaches multiple types of provisioning messages sent to the client.)**

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the provisioning system, as taught by Donlan, by transmitting the provisioning message to the host, as taught by McKeown, for the purpose of enabling different procedures for different versions of the same type of device to be accommodated (see Paragraph 0098 of McKeown).

However, Donlan combined with Borelli and McKeown does not explicitly teach generating a host-specific configuration message based on a host protocol file wherein the host protocol file is associated with the host type.

In an analogous art, Makofka, which discloses a system for service provisioning, clearly teaches a server (MSO) which contains a processor that derives a host-specific provisioning message based on a protocol file containing host-specific commands (see Paragraphs 0081-0086 for dividing the set top box functionality

Art Unit: 2421

into functional units (protocol file information) and assigning information to the functional unit (thereby creating the provisioning message) that will allow a client to access certain functions of the client device based on the information assigned to each functional unit (therefore teaching that the processor derives the host-specific provisioning message based on protocol (client device) information that contains host-specific commands (what functional units are available to be accessed)).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the provisioning system host file, as taught by Donlan and McKeown, using the protocol file information (information about the client devices functionality) that is used for creating additional provisioning message information, as taught by Makofka, for the purpose of allowing authorization of functional units (client device functionality) to be controlled in a flexible way (see Paragraph 0090 of Makofka).

Consider **claims 107 and 108**, Donlan combined with Borelli, as in claim 40, clearly teaches a web site provisioning system communicating with an enhanced services system.

However, Donlan combined with Borelli does not explicitly teach sending the host-specific configuration message to a host associated with the cable subscriber.

In an analogous art, McKeown, which discloses a system for service provisioning, clearly teaches sending the host-specific configuration message to a host associated with the cable subscriber. **(Paragraph 0077 describes a provisioning sequence used to allow "end-to-end" provisioning of a user device. Paragraph 0084 describes determining parameters automatically by querying the user device itself. Paragraph 0142 discusses remotely reconfiguring the user access device to modify a characteristic of the service delivered. And finally, Paragraph 0154 discusses dynamically assigning addresses to end user devices. The examiner notes that Paragraphs 0274-0283 describe the dynamic assignment of IP addresses provisioned to end user devices through the well-known DHCP protocol. Therefore, McKeown teaches multiple types of provisioning messages sent to the client.)**

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the provisioning system, as taught by Donlan, by transmitting the provisioning message to the host, as taught by McKeown, for the purpose of enabling different procedures for different versions of the same type of device to be accommodated (see Paragraph 0098 of McKeown).

Art Unit: 2421

However, Donlan combined with Borelli and McKeown does not explicitly teach generating a host-specific configuration message based on a host protocol file wherein the host protocol file is associated with the host type.

In an analogous art, Makofka, which discloses a system for service provisioning, clearly teaches a server (MSO) which contains a processor that derives a host-specific provisioning message based on a protocol file containing host-specific commands (see Paragraphs 0081-0086 for dividing the set top box functionality into functional units (protocol file information) and assigning information to the functional unit (thereby creating the provisioning message) that will allow a client to access certain functions of the client device based on the information assigned to each functional unit (therefore teaching that the processor derives the host-specific provisioning message based on protocol (client device) information that contains host-specific commands (what functional units are available to be accessed)).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the provisioning system host file, as taught by Donlan and McKeown, using the protocol file information (information about the client devices functionality) that is used for creating additional provisioning message information, as taught by Makofka, for the purpose of allowing authorization of functional units (client device functionality) to be controlled in a flexible way (see Paragraph 0090 of Makofka).

Consider **claim 109**, Borelli clearly teaches the web site is hosted by an Internet Provisioning Service Gateway ISPG that selects the enhanced services system from a plurality of enhanced services systems based on the cable subscriber identification data. **([0038] and [0040])**

Consider **claim 111**, Borelli clearly teaches the cable service data pertains to a digital video program offered on a cable network. **(The services include services provided by broadband content providers and broadband service providers, i.e. cable services, [0030].)**

Consider **claim 112**, Borelli clearly teaches the cable service data pertains to high speed Internet access. **([0030] Borelli)**

Consider **claim 121**, Donlan combined with Borelli, as in claim 51, clearly teaches a web site provisioning system communicating with an enhanced services system.

However, Donlan combined with Borelli does not explicitly teach sending the host-specific configuration message to a host associated with the cable subscriber.

Art Unit: 2421

In an analogous art, McKeown, which discloses a system for service provisioning, clearly teaches sending the host-specific configuration message to a host associated with the cable subscriber. **(Paragraph 0077 describes a provisioning sequence used to allow "end-to-end" provisioning of a user device. Paragraph 0084 describes determining parameters automatically by querying the user device itself. Paragraph 0142 discusses remotely reconfiguring the user access device to modify a characteristic of the service delivered. And finally, Paragraph 0154 discusses dynamically assigning addresses to end user devices. The examiner notes that Paragraphs 0274-0283 describe the dynamic assignment of IP addresses provisioned to end user devices through the well-known DHCP protocol. Therefore, McKeown teaches multiple types of provisioning messages sent to the client.)**

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the provisioning system, as taught by Donlan, by transmitting the provisioning message to the host, as taught by McKeown, for the purpose of enabling different procedures for different versions of the same type of device to be accommodated (see Paragraph 0098 of McKeown).

However, Donlan combined with Borelli and McKeown does not explicitly teach generating a host-specific configuration message based on a host protocol file wherein the host protocol file is associated with the host type.

In an analogous art, Makofka, which discloses a system for service provisioning, clearly teaches a server (MSO) which contains a processor that derives a host-specific provisioning message based on a protocol file containing host-specific commands (see Paragraphs 0081-0086 for dividing the set top box functionality into functional units (protocol file information) and assigning information to the functional unit (thereby creating the provisioning message) that will allow a client to access certain functions of the client device based on the information assigned to each functional unit (therefore teaching that the processor derives the host-specific provisioning message based on protocol (client device) information that contains host-specific commands (what functional units are available to be accessed)).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the provisioning system host file, as taught by Donlan and McKeown, using the protocol file information (information about the client devices functionality) that is used for creating additional provisioning message information, as taught by Makofka, for the purpose of allowing authorization of functional units (client device functionality) to be controlled in a flexible way (see Paragraph 0090 of Makofka).

Consider **claim 122**, Donlan clearly teaches the host type is determined in part using the user identifier. **([0043])**

Consider **claim 123**, Donlan clearly teaches the host type is determined by a parameter contained in the second message. **(Host type is sent to the provisioning system, [0046].)**

Consider **claim 124**, Borelli clearly teaches the ISPG determines the enhanced services system based on the cable network provider. **([0064] Borelli)**

8. Claims **40, 46, 47 and 113** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Donlan et al. (US 2004/0088737)** in view of **Borelli et al. (US 2006/0020525)** further in view of **McKeown et al. (US 2004/0261116)**, herein McKeown.

Consider **claim 113**, Donlan combined with Borelli, as in claims 40 and 51, clearly teaches a web site provisioning system communicating with an enhanced services system.

In an analogous art, McKeown, which discloses a system for service provisioning, clearly teaches a provisioning system similar to Donlan, but further defines that equipment type information further includes manufacturer and model information **(see Paragraph 0098)**.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the device type information, as taught by Donlan, using the manufacturer and model information, as taught by McKeown, for the purpose of enabling different procedures for different versions of the same type of device to be accommodated (see Paragraph 0098 of McKeown).

Consider **claim 40**, see claim 113.

Consider **claims 46 and 47**, Donlan combined with Borelli, as in claim 40, clearly teaches a web site provisioning system communicating with an enhanced services system.

However, Donlan combined with Borelli does not explicitly teach sending the host-specific configuration message to a host associated with the cable subscriber.

Art Unit: 2421

In an analogous art, McKeown, which discloses a system for service provisioning, clearly teaches sending the host-specific configuration message to a host associated with the cable subscriber. **(Paragraph 0077 describes a provisioning sequence used to allow "end-to-end" provisioning of a user device. Paragraph 0084 describes determining parameters automatically by querying the user device itself. Paragraph 0142 discusses remotely reconfiguring the user access device to modify a characteristic of the service delivered. And finally, Paragraph 0154 discusses dynamically assigning addresses to end user devices. The examiner notes that Paragraphs 0274-0283 describe the dynamic assignment of IP addresses provisioned to end user devices through the well-known DHCP protocol. Therefore, McKeown teaches multiple types of provisioning messages sent to the client.)**

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the provisioning system, as taught by Donlan, by transmitting the provisioning message to the host, as taught by McKeown, for the purpose of enabling different procedures for different versions of the same type of device to be accommodated (see Paragraph 0098 of McKeown).

9. Claim **42** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Donlan et al. (US 2004/0088737)** in view of **Borelli et al. (US 2006/0020525)** further in view of **Tamura (US 2003/0048380)**.

Consider **claim 42**, Donlan combined with Borelli, as in claim 40, clearly teaches a web site provisioning system communicating with an enhanced services system.

However, Donlan combined with Borelli does not explicitly teach the second provisioning message further includes a conditional access module identifier.

In an analogous art, Tamura, which discloses a system for provisioning a set-top box, clearly teaches the second provisioning message further includes a conditional access module identifier. **(Smart card identifier [0027] Tamura)**

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Donlan combined Borelli by using a smart card identifier, as taught by Tamura, for the benefit of providing system specific provisioning of the set-top box (see [0004] Tamura).

Art Unit: 2421

10. Claim **110** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Donlan et al. (US 2004/0088737)** in view of **Borelli et al. (US 2006/0020525)** in view of **McKeown et al. (US 2004/0261116)** in view of **Makofka et al. (US 2002/0112175)** further in view of **Tamura (US 2003/0048380)**.

Consider **claim 110**, Donlan combined with Borelli, McKeown and Makofka, as in claim 108, clearly teaches a web site provisioning system communicating with an enhanced services system.

However, Donlan combined with Borelli, McKeown and Makofka does not explicitly teach the provisioning message includes conditional access module identifier data.

In an analogous art, Tamura, which discloses a system for provisioning a set-top box, clearly teaches the provisioning message includes conditional access module identifier data. (**Smart card identifier [0027] Tamura**)

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Donlan combined Borelli, McKeown and Makofka by using a smart card identifier, as taught by Tamura, for the benefit of providing system specific provisioning of the set-top box (see [0004] Tamura).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOHN SCHNURR whose telephone number is (571)270-1458. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9a-5p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on (571) 272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2421

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John W. Miller/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2421

JRS

Application/Control Number: 10/712,832
Art Unit: 2421

Page 15